



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Technology Center 1700

APR 18 2005
Mailed: _____

MEB
Paper Number:

In re application of :
Toshio Morita, et al. : DECISION ON
Serial No. 10/699,645 : PETITION
Filed: November 04, 2003 :
For: Fine Carbon Fiber, Method For Producing The Same And Electrically
Conducting Material Comprising The Fine Carbon Fiber :

This is a response to the request to rescind the Notice of Abandonment, filed January 21, 2005. This request is treated as a PETITION TO WITHDRAW ABANDONMENT, under 37 C.F.R. 1.181 (no fee required). The petition requests that the abandonment, as set forth in the Notice of Abandonment of November 22, 2004, for failure to timely reply to the office action of May 13, 2004 be withdrawn. The petitioner asserts that the response was timely filed on June 14, 2004. The petitioner has provided a copy of the date-stamped receipt card evidencing the filing of the response on June 14, 2004, and a copy of the response to the office action filed June 14, 2004.

DECISION

The instant request is accepted as a timely petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.181 (no fee), and is evaluated under the procedures regarding a Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Evidence That a Reply Was Timely Mailed or Filed.

As set forth in MPEP 711.03(c), 37 CFR 1.10(c) through 1.10(e) set forth procedures for petitioning the Director of the USPTO to accord a filing date to correspondence as of the date of deposit of the correspondence as "Express Mail." A petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment relying upon a timely reply placed in "Express Mail" must include an appropriate petition under 37 CFR 1.10(c), (d), or (e) (see MPEP § 513). When a paper is shown to have been mailed to the Office using the "Express Mail" procedures, the paper must be entered in PALM with the "Express Mail" date.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Technology Center 1700

Similarly, applicants may establish that a reply was filed with a postcard receipt that properly identifies the reply and provides prima facie evidence that the reply was timely filed. See MPEP § 503. For example, if the application has been held abandoned for failure to file a reply to a first Office action, and applicant has a postcard receipt showing that an amendment was timely filed in response to the Office action, then the holding of abandonment should be withdrawn upon the filing of a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. When the reply is shown to have been timely filed based on a postcard receipt, the reply must be entered into PALM using the date of receipt of the reply as shown on the post card receipt. Where a certificate of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8, but not a postcard receipt, is relied upon in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment, see 37 CFR 1.8(b) and MPEP § 512. As stated in 37 CFR 1.8(b)(3) the statement that attests to the previous timely mailing or transmission of the correspondence must be on a personal knowledge basis, or to the satisfaction of the Director of the USPTO. If the statement attesting to the previous timely mailing is not made by the person who signed the Certificate of Mailing (i.e., there is no personal knowledge basis), then the statement attesting to the previous timely mailing should include evidence that supports the conclusion that the correspondence was actually mailed (e.g., copies of a mailing log establishing that correspondence was mailed for that application). When the correspondence is shown to have been timely filed based on a certificate of mailing, the correspondence is entered into PALM with the actual date of receipt (i.e., the date that the duplicate copy of the papers was filed with the statement under 37 CFR 1.8).

The petitioner's showing of the copy of the date-stamped receipt card evidencing the filing of the response on June 14, 2004 is sufficient. The application will be forwarded to the examiner for processing and consideration of the papers filed June 14, 2004, a copy of which is provided as an attachment to the instant petition.

The Petition is **Granted**.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Technology Center 1700

OmStone

Jacqueline Stone, Director
Technology Center 1700
Chemical and Materials Engineering

Sheldon I. Landsman
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213